

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-19 were pending in the application. The Board of Appeals affirmed the final rejection of claims 1-19 in the order dated January 3, 2008. No claims were withdrawn. No claims were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 5 and 9 are canceled without prejudice or devotion of the subject matter to the public, claims 1, 13, 14 and 19 are amended, and no new claims are added. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 19 can at least be found in claims 5 and 9 including the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. Support for the amendment to claim 13 may at least be found at page 4, first paragraph of Applicant's specification as originally filed. Support for the amendment to claim 14 may at least be found in the Summary of the Invention and at the first paragraph of page 3; last paragraph, page 4 through third paragraph, page 5; and, last paragraph, page 6 through the second paragraph, page 9 of Applicant's specification as filed. No new matter is presented.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner asserts claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim such matter as the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant traverses the rejection.

In affirming the present rejection, the Board of Appeals stated claim 13 contains no earlier recitation or limitation of the claim term "said at least one moveable platform". The Board indicated the lack of an earlier recitation of the claim term "moveable platform" rendered the claim indefinite because it was unclear as to what element "said...moveable platform" refers.

Applicant has amended claim 13 to indicate what constitutes the "moveable platform". In particular, Applicant's amended claim 13 now recites the "at least one moveable platform" "comprises one of the following: a boat, an airplane, a spacecraft, an automobile, or a truck". Applicant contends it is now clear what the element "said...moveable platform" now refers based upon the additional limitations recited therein.

For at least this reason, Applicant contends amended claim 13 is definite and complies with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and find claim 13 is allowable.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner asserts claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,449,103 to Charles (“Charles”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0044751 to Pugliese et al. (“Pugliese”). Applicant traverses the rejection.

In affirming the present rejection, the Board indicated that while Applicant’s specification disclosed an example of a mobile device such as a wireless PC tablet, Applicant’s specification failed to provide an express definition of the claim term “mobile device”. As a result, the Board applied a standard definition of “mobile device” to encompass any device that is moveable. The Board then determined Charles discloses a mobile device at column 59, lines 10-12, and Pugliese discloses the following: “one or more hinged video cameras in associated motors...moveable to view items within a 360° arc and hinged to move vertically”, which the Board determined also constituted a “mobile device”. The Board further determined that Charles discloses a system and method for gathering visual data and providing the data to a user over the internet and Pugliese discloses obtaining video images through a moveable camera and sharing the said images over a network to a “a group of users”. The Board determined one of ordinary skill in the art, given the method of obtaining images of Charles had a market need to provide images over a network would have a finite number of predictable solutions. And, in one predictable solution as disclosed by Pugliese, the images obtained by the moveable imaging device of Charles are shared over a network to a group of viewers.

Applicant’s amended independent claim 1, now recites the following:

“1. An integrated system comprising: a portal; a server communicating with said portal; at least one wireless local area network in communication with said server; at least one mobile device in wireless communication with said at least one wireless local area network; a visual data device in communication with said at least one mobile device; and a means for enabling two-way communications between said portal and said server, wherein said at least one mobile device comprises a PC tablet.”

Applicant’s amended independent claim 14 now recites the following:

“14. A method for providing remote, interactive visual analysis of an apparatus, comprising the steps of: providing a portal, said portal in communication with at least one electronic device; providing a server in two-way communication with said portal via the internet; integrating said server into a wireless local area network; connecting at least one mobile device to said local area network; providing visual data from at least one

visual device to said at least one mobile device; receiving said visual data at said at least one electronic device; and analyzing a turbine engine of the apparatus using said visual data.”

Applicant’s amended claim 1 now recites a visual data device is in communication with at least one mobile device, and the mobile device comprises a PC tablet. Applicant contends Charles may disclose certain devices at column 59, lines 10-12, but none of the devices disclosed therein are equivalent to, suggest or provide the requisite motivation to use a PC tablet in communication with a visual data device. None of the devices taught by Charles embodies a PC tablet as recited in Applicant’s claim 1. Pugliese also fails to teach or suggest the combination of a PC tablet in communication with a visual data device as recited in Applicant’s claim 1. The hinged video camera taught by Pugliese may be moveable but one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes a person cannot carry the video camera as a person may carry a PC tablet.

Applicant’s amended claim 14 now recites the additional step of analyzing the turbine engine on the apparatus using the visual data. Applicant contends neither Charles nor Pugliese teaches utilizing the input from the video cameras taught therein to analyze a turbine engine. There is nothing disclosed in either Pugliese or Charles to suggest or provide the requisite motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to consider distributing or viewing video input of the visual analysis of a turbine engine to a group of individuals over the Internet. Pugliese does not teach utilizing video input beyond providing online consumers a better look at a product he or she would like to purchase. Likewise, Charles does not teach using the optical system disclosed therein to visually inspect turbine engines or any other apparatus over the internet. Applicant contends the method for providing a remote, interactive visual analysis of an apparatus cannot be found in the combined teachings of Charles in view of Pugliese.

For at least these reasons, Applicant contends claims 1-19 are patentable and not obvious in view of the combined teachings of Charles in view of Pugliese.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and find claims 1-19 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims as pending patentably define over the art of record and an early indication of same is respectfully requested.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

It is submitted that the claims as amended herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit Account No.21-0279.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID C. LODA

By /Ross J. Christie #47492/

Ross J. Christie

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No.: 47,492

Telephone: 203-777-6628 x116

Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: March 3, 2008